

The Scales of Brane Nucleation Processes

S. P. de Alwis

Perimeter Institute, 31 Caroline Street N.,

Waterloo, ON N2L 2Y5, Canada and

Department of Physics,

University of Colorado,

Box 390, Boulder, CO 80309.

e-mail: dealwis@pizero.colorado.edu PACS : 11.25. -w, 98.80.-k

Abstract

The scales associated with Brown-Teitelboim-Bousso-Polchinski processes of brane nucleation, which result in changes of the flux parameters and the number of D-branes, are discussed in the context of type IIB models with all moduli stabilized. It is argued that such processes are unlikely to be described by effective field theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

There are two approaches to dynamics on the landscape of classical solutions to (the supergravity limit of) string theory.

1. The universe is the result of a tunneling event as in traditional quantum cosmology [1][2][3] except that instead of tunneling from nothing, the pre-tunneling state is the result of spontaneous compactification and decay of high string states (which may be modeled by a thermal state at a temperature somewhat below the Hagedorn temperature). The different end states of this tunneling process are the different four dimensional effective field theories that are supposed to constitute the landscape of string theory.

2. The second is a process of brane nucleation a la Brown and Teitelboim (BT) [4]. This is analogous to the Schwinger effect of pair production of charged particles by a strong electric field in two dimensions. The currently observed universe (with a tiny cosmological constant (CC)) is supposed to be the end result of this process of brane nucleation. In the generalization of this argument by Bousso and Polchinski (BP) [5] to string theory, this process can result in getting a universe with a tiny cosmological constant (CC) even though the brane tension is not parametrically below the string scale.

In [6] Brustein and the author addressed the first scenario [25]. In this paper we will discuss the second, using type IIB models with flux compactifications [26] and non-perturbative terms [7] (KKLT) [27]. In particular we will determine under what conditions this process could be described by an effective supergravity. This means that given a state which has such a description, which we will take to be a final state of the nucleation process such as the observed universe, we wish to investigate whether its immediate antecedent state is also describable by effective supergravity. What we will find is that although generically the antecedent state is strongly curved (at higher than the string scale) there are non-generic situations where a supergravity description of the antecedent state is possible. However even in those situations the required domain wall brane has a tension which is above the string scale so that it does not seem possible to describe its nucleation in low energy effective supergravity.

In section 2 we discuss the relation between different scales and estimate the tension of the relevant brane, and in section 3 estimate the cosmological constants in the two states and discuss the transition.

II. A MATTER OF SCALES - THE DOMAIN WALL TENSION

In this section we analyze the tensions of branes and the change in the CC in the Einstein frame defined by GKP [8]. Here in addition to warping we also put in the dependence of the metric on the volume modulus.

The metric ansatz is [28]:

$$ds^2 = g_{MN}^S dx^M dx^N = e^{\phi/2} [e^{-6u(x)+2A(y)} g_{\mu\nu}(x) dx^\mu dx^\nu + e^{2u(x)-2A(y)} g_{mn}(y) dy^m dy^n] \quad (1)$$

In the above g_{MN} is the ten-dimensional string metric and the ansatz ensures that $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is the four dimensional Einstein metric and g_{mn} is the Ricci-flat metric on the internal space which is usually taken to be a Calabi-Yau manifold. $u(x)$ is the volume modulus and we've ignored the other moduli since they do not enter into the relation between the Planck and string scales. Also it is convenient to take the effective volume of the internal manifold to be at the string scale when $u = 0$, in other words we put

$$\int_X d^6 y e^{-4A(y)} \sqrt{g^{(6)}(y)} = (2\pi)^6 \alpha'^3 \quad (2)$$

Reducing the 10 D action using this ansatz gives

$$S = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^7 \alpha'^4} \left[\int d^4 x \int d^6 y \sqrt{g^{S(10)}(x, y)} e^{-2\phi} g_s^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}^S + \dots \right] \quad (3)$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^7 \alpha'^4} \left[\int d^6 y e^{-4A(y)} g^{(6)}(y) \int d^4 x \sqrt{g^{(4)}} R^{(4)}(x) + \dots \right] \quad (4)$$

From the second line we can read off the 4D Planck scale (by identifying the coefficients of the 4D Einstein action as $M_p^2/2$)

$$M_P^2 = \frac{2}{(2\pi)^7 \alpha'^4} \int_X d^6 y e^{-4A(y)} \sqrt{g^{(6)}(y)} = \frac{2}{2\pi \alpha'} \quad (5)$$

This is of course measured in the 4D Einstein metric and in the same metric the string scale can be identified by writing the string action as,

$$\begin{aligned} I &\sim \frac{1}{2\pi \alpha'} \int d^2 \sigma \left[\frac{1}{2} g_{MN}^S \partial X^M \bar{\partial} X^N + \dots \right] \\ &\sim \frac{1}{2\pi \alpha'} \int d^2 \sigma \left[\frac{1}{2} e^{\phi(x)/2} e^{-6u(x)} e^{2A(y)} g_{\mu\nu} \partial X^\mu \bar{\partial} X^\mu + \dots \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The effective string tension (measured in the 4D Einstein metric) is actually space-time dependent unless the dilaton and the volume modulus are stabilized. Henceforth we will use

u, ϕ for the stabilized values of the volume modulus and the dilaton. The tension is also dependent on the warp factor and is given by

$$T_s \equiv M_s^2 = \frac{e^{\phi/2} e^{-6u} e^{2A(y)}}{2\pi\alpha'}. \quad (7)$$

Thus in these units the string scale in any throat region will depend on how far down the throat it is measured. The ratio of the Planck scale to the string scale (which is in fact the physically meaningful quantity) is

$$\frac{M_s^2}{M_P^2} = \frac{1}{2} e^{\phi/2} e^{-6u} e^{2A(y)}. \quad (8)$$

This formula illustrates the fact that in highly warped regions (down some AdS like throat region that approximates the RS1 [9] scenario as in GKP) the Planck scale can be much higher than the string scale [10]. The same formula illustrates the fact that this hierarchy of scales can alternatively be obtained by taking a large volume ($e^u \gg 1$) compactification.

Now consider two different flux compactifications separated in (3+1) dimensions by a domain wall which in IIB theory could be a D5 brane wrapping a three cycle in the internal manifold. We could also consider an NS5 brane but the results would be very similar except for the factor of the dilaton which has only a marginal effect in the following.

In the string metric the tension of the five brane is given by the formula $T_5 = e^{-\phi}/(2\pi)^5 \alpha'^3$. The relevant term in the five brane action is,

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^5 \alpha'^3} \left| \int_A \Omega \right| \int d^3x e^{-6u(x)+\phi(x)/2} \sqrt{g^{(3)}(x)}, \quad (9)$$

where A is the three cycle wrapped by the brane and Ω is the holomorphic three form on X . So the effective tension of the domain wall measured in the 4D Einstein metric is

$$T_{dw} = \frac{|z|}{(2\pi)^2 \alpha'^{3/2}} e^{-6u+\phi/2}, \quad (10)$$

where we have introduced the complex structure modulus associated with the three cycle wrapped by the brane by writing $\int \Omega = (2\pi)^3 \alpha'^{3/2} z$. To estimate the Kaluza-Klein (KK) masses consider for instance the dilaton kinetic term

$$- \int d^{10}x e^{-2\phi} \sqrt{g_s^{(10)}} g_s^{MN} (R_{MN} - 4\partial_M \phi \partial_N \phi) \rightarrow - \int \sqrt{g^{(4)}(x) g^{(6)}(y)} \quad (11)$$

$$[e^{-4A} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi + e^{-8u} g^{mn} \partial_m \phi \partial_n \phi]$$

Thus we get the KK masses to be

$$M_{KK}^2 \sim \frac{\langle e^{-4A} \rangle_X^{-1}}{2\pi\alpha'} e^{-8u}, \quad (12)$$

where we have defined $\langle e^{-4A} \rangle_X = \int_X e^{-4A} v^2 / \int_X v^2$ where v is the KK wave function. Since one expects the KK modes to be localized at the end of the Klebanov-Strassler (KS) throat (as in [11] for the RS1 case - see also [12]) this average may be estimated by using the value far down the throat. In doing so we need to take into account the dependence of the warp factor on the volume modulus as discussed in [13]. In other words we need to write (assuming as before that the volume modulus is fixed at some space time independent value)

$$e^{-4A} = 1 + e^{-4u} h(y). \quad (13)$$

Here $h(y)$ is defined to give zero when integrated over X with metric g_{mn} . Far down some warped throat h becomes large and takes the value $h_{max} = e^{8K/3Mg_s} \equiv e^{-4A_{min}}$ with $K, M, K \gg M$ a pair of flux integers, according to equation (3.19) of GKP. So the criterion for non-trivial warping is $e^{-4u} e^{-4A_{min}} \gg 1$. Then we have for these KK modes which are localized down the throat

$$M_{KK}^2 \sim \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} e^{4A_{min}} e^{-4u}.$$

Similarly down this throat the effective string scale is warped down giving,

$$M_s^2 \sim \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} e^{2A_{min}} e^{-4u} e^{\phi/2}.$$

$$\frac{M_{KK}^2}{M_s^2} \sim e^{-\phi/2} e^{2A_{min}}. \quad (14)$$

So the warped KK scale is below the warped string scale at least if the string coupling is not too small.

Now we may compute the ratios of the effective tension of the domain wall wrapping a three cycle at the end of the throat to the warped string scale, the Planck scale and the warped KK scale:

$$\frac{T_{dw}}{M_s^3} \sim e^{-\phi/4} e^{-3A_{min}} |z| \sim e^{-\phi/4} \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{T_{dw}}{M_P^3} \sim e^{-6u+\phi/2} |z| \sim e^{-6u+\phi/2} e^{3A_{min}} \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{T_{dw}}{M_{KK}^3} \sim e^{\phi/2} e^{-6A_{min}} |z| \sim e^{\phi/2} e^{-3A_{min}} \quad (17)$$

In these expressions we've ignored factors of $O(1)$ and retained only the modulus/dilaton/warp factor dependences and in the last estimate we've used the value $z \sim e^{3A_{min}}$ given in equation (3.19) of GKP [8].

From (16) we see that the tension is always below the Planck scale for large volume compactifications as observed in [14]. But from (15) we see that T_{dw} is above the string scale regardless of the size of the cycle relative to the bulk [29]. The same is true of the ratio to the KK scale. In other words the spontaneous nucleation of these domain walls (and hence bubbles of different flux vacua) cannot be described within effective field theory. To put it another way, in regions way down some KS throat, where massive modes are likely to be localized, with $e^{A_{min}} \ll 1$, the domain wall tension is above the local string scale and way above the local KK scale.

III. THE BTBP PROCESS IN IIB

In the Brown Teitelboim process (adapted to a multi-flux/brane situation by Bousso and Polchinski) it was assumed that the effective cosmological constant (CC) is given by a formula of the form

$$\lambda = \lambda_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^J n_i^2 q_i^2.$$

Here the first term is the CC coming from all other sources (both classical and quantum) and is assumed to be negative. The second term is the explicit contribution of the fluxes with $\{n_i\}$ being a set of integers characterizing the flux configuration and $\{q_i\}$ being the set of charges associated with branes wrapping any one of the J cycles in the compact manifold. In the original BT process there was only one charge and then in order to obtain an effective CC of $O(10^{-120})$ in Planck units it was necessary to have a charge of the same order. However as Bousso and Polchinski showed if we have many charges (as would be the case typically in string theory compactified on a manifold with many cycles say $O(100)$) the discretuum of values of the cosmological constant would be sufficiently dense, so that even with relatively large charges (say $O(1/10)$) there would be some which are within the acceptable range.

Within a semi-classical approximation BT had derived (in a manner similar to that in the seminal work of Coleman and De Luccia [15]) the probability of brane nucleation. It was argued that in 4-space the effect of brane nucleation was to create a bubble of lower

(or higher) values of the cosmological constant separated by a domain wall consisting of a closed brane configuration. Also while transitions to lower values will take place at some finite rate, upward transitions could not happen for non-compact 3-space, while if space was compact they could take place but at some suppressed rate. Furthermore transitions from a positive to a negative value of the CC were also suppressed.

However the BP argument was made in a context where the moduli (in particular the sizes of the cycles and hence the values of the charges) were not stabilized. So a proper discussion of this process requires one to consider an explicit string theory model such as that of GKP-KKLT [8][7] in type IIB compactified on a Calabi-Yau orientifold X . In order to cancel tadpoles one introduces D_3 (and D_7) branes and turns on three form fluxes. The fluxes generate a potential for the dilaton and complex structure moduli ($z^i, i = 1, \dots, h_{21}$). By adding non-perturbative effects a potential for the Kaehler moduli $T_i, i = 1, \dots, h_{11}$ can also be generated. This potential is in the classic $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUGRA form and is given in terms of a Kaehler potential (assuming for simplicity just one Kaehler modulus i.e. $h_{11} = 1$)

$$K = -\ln(S + \bar{S}) - 3\ln(T + \bar{T}) - \ln[i \int_X \Omega \wedge \bar{\Omega}], \quad (18)$$

and a superpotential

$$W = \int_X G_3 \wedge \Omega + C e^{-aT}. \quad (19)$$

In the above $S = e^{-\phi} + iC_0$ and $T = e^{4u} + ib$ with C_0 being the RR zero-form and b is an axion related to the RR four-form field of IIB string theory. We also set $2\pi\alpha' = 1$ in the following. Also Ω is the holomorphic three form on X and

$$G_3 = F_3 + iSH_3$$

with $F_3(H_3)$ being RR (NSNS) three form fluxes threading some three cycles in X . As is well-known (see for example [16] for a review) these fluxes are quantized and by expanding in a basis of (A and B) three cycles the first (flux) term of (19) can be written as

$$W_{flux} \equiv \int_X G_3 \wedge \Omega = (2\pi) \sum_i [(n_A^i + iSm_A^i)\mathcal{G}_i(z) - (n_i^B + iSm_i^B)z^i]. \quad (20)$$

Here the z^i are projective coordinates (defined by the periods of Ω) on the complex structure moduli space, $\mathcal{G}_i = \partial\mathcal{G}/\partial z^i$ with $\mathcal{G}$ being a homogeneous function of degree two in the z^i and the n 's and m 's are integers.

An elementary brane nucleation transition (of the sort that was considered by BT) would correspond for example to a shift of the form

$$n_j^B \rightarrow n_j^B \pm 1,$$

for one flux integer with all others unchanged [30]. This would lead to a change of the superpotential

$$\Delta W = \pm 2\pi z^j. \quad (21)$$

To find the change in the potential and the corresponding change in the stabilized values of the moduli is not easy in general. However we may estimate these values by adopting the two stage procedure of KKLT. So we assume that it is possible to integrate out the complex structure moduli and the axi-dilaton before adding the NP term giving a constant flux superpotential (for each choice of fluxes) and then consider a simple theory of the one remaining modulus T . This means taking $K = -3 \ln(T + \bar{T}) + O(1)$ and $W = W_0 + C e^{-aT}$ giving a potential (setting for simplicity the imaginary part $T_I = 0$)

$$V = v \frac{a C e^{-aT_R}}{2T_R^2} [W_0 + C e^{-aT_R} (1 + \frac{1}{3} a T_R)] \quad (22)$$

with v an $O(1)$ constant. This potential has a supersymmetric AdS minimum determined by $D_T W = 0$, i.e.

$$W_0 = -(1 + \frac{2T_R a}{3}) C e^{-aT_R}. \quad (23)$$

KKLT go on to lift this minimum to get a dS solution by a rather ad hoc procedure. For our purposes we do not need this - in fact before we take into account the effects of integrating down from just below the string scale all the way to the Hubble scale (where the CC is determined) all that one needs to ensure is that the CC produced from a string theory argument is of the order of the TeV scale, since one expects an effect of at least this order from supersymmetry breaking, the standard model phase transition and associated quantum fluctuations. Thus we will take the above minimum as representing the one that we find ourselves in, modulo the effects just mentioned.

The question then is what was the prior state which gave rise to this flux configuration. First we note that for the scheme to be valid (i.e. $T_R > 1$, and $aT_R > 1$ as pointed out by KKLT) we should have $W_0 \ll 1$. Indeed to have a CC at the standard model scale we need (calling the final (initial) value of the CC $V_0^f(V_0^i)$)

$$V_0^f \sim -\frac{|W_0^f|^2}{T_R^3} \ll 1. \quad (24)$$

Let us now estimate the CC of the immediate prior state to this - in other words the potential minimum of the state from which this universe was created by bubble nucleation. The change in the superpotential is given in (21) and since this is much greater than W_0 , the CC of the state from which the final state was nucleated had a CC of the order of

$$|V_0^i| \sim \frac{z^2}{T_R^3} \sim \frac{e^{6A_{min}}}{T_R^3}. \quad (25)$$

In the last step we have assumed that the three cycle which is wrapped by the nucleated five-brane is the three cycle in the KS throat with z the corresponding complex structure modulus which was estimated in equation (3.19) of GKP [8]. Let us now measure this against the string scale using (7) .

$$\frac{V_0^i}{M_s^4} \sim e^{2A_{min}} e^{-\phi} e^{-4u} \sim \frac{1}{g_s} e^{-4\pi K/3Mg_s} e^{-4u} \ll 1, \quad (26)$$

where K, M are integers characterizing the fluxes through the relevant pair of dual three cycles. We are assuming of course that the values of the moduli (in particular T_R in the initial and final state are not parametrically different, consistent with (21) and (23).

Thus we have shown that although one might expect that the generic initial state has a CC that is around the string scale, so there is no possibility of a supergravity description of the initial state, for strongly warped large volume configurations, it is possible to have such a description [31]. However as we argued at the end of the previous section (see (17)(15)) even for branes wrapping the shrinking three cycle down the KS throat, the domain wall tension is larger than the string scale and much larger than the KK scale!

Thus it seems that even though there are flux configurations with a strongly warped throat that allow a supergravity description of both the final state and the initial state - the brane nucleation process requires a brane whose effective tension is well above the (local) string scale. In contrast to working in string perturbation theory with a static background of D-branes (which have tensions that are larger than the string scale) here we have dynamical processes that are taking place at or above the string scale. The brane *nucleation* involves a redistribution of energy density at scales which are greater than or equal to the string scale, and therefore one cannot really expect there to be a low-energy effective field theory description of this. One should expect that at the same time as these branes are nucleated, stringy states could also be created. Even if it is the case that Coleman-De Luccia type calculations [15] are still valid for estimating the transition probabilities, the end point of

the transition is unlikely to have a semi-classical description. As pointed out in [17] there is also a problem of constructing a background independent effective supergravity action that describes such processes. Of course this does not mean that there are no such transitions in string theory. It simply casts doubt on the existence of a supergravity description of the dynamics.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Cliff Burgess and Kerim Suruliz for stimulating discussions on warped compactifications and Fernando Quevedo for useful correspondence. In addition I wish to thank the members of the landscape discussion group (especially Tom Banks, Steve Giddings and Anshuman Maharana) at the KITP workshop on String Phenomenology, for useful comments. I also wish to acknowledge the hospitality of KITP while this work was being revised. This research is supported by DOE grant No. DE-FG02-91-ER-40672 and the Perimeter Institute.

-
- [1] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. **D28**, 2960 (1983).
 - [2] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. **D27**, 2848 (1983).
 - [3] A. D. Linde, Sov. Phys. JETP **60**, 211 (1984).
 - [4] J. D. Brown and C. Teitelboim, Nucl. Phys. **B297**, 787 (1988).
 - [5] R. Bousso and J. Polchinski, JHEP **06**, 006 (2000), hep-th/0004134.
 - [6] R. Brustein and S. P. de Alwis, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 046009 (2006), hep-th/0511093.
 - [7] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde, and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 046005 (2003), hep-th/0301240.
 - [8] S. B. Giddings, S. Kachru, and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 106006 (2002), hep-th/0105097.
 - [9] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999), hep-ph/9905221.
 - [10] O. DeWolfe and S. B. Giddings, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 066008 (2003), hep-th/0208123.
 - [11] W. D. Goldberger and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4922 (1999), hep-ph/9907447.
 - [12] A. R. Frey and A. Maharana (2006), hep-th/0603233.
 - [13] S. B. Giddings and A. Maharana, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 126003 (2006), hep-th/0507158.

- [14] S. Kachru, X. Liu, M. B. Schulz, and S. P. Trivedi, JHEP **05**, 014 (2003), hep-th/0205108.
- [15] S. R. Coleman and F. De Luccia, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 3305 (1980).
- [16] M. Grana, Phys. Rept. **423**, 91 (2006), hep-th/0509003.
- [17] S. P. de Alwis (2006), hep-th/0605184.
- [18] S. Sarangi and S. H. H. Tye (2005), hep-th/0505104.
- [19] S. Kachru, J. Pearson, and H. L. Verlinde, JHEP **06**, 021 (2002), hep-th/0112197.
- [20] A. R. Frey, M. Lippert, and B. Williams, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 046008 (2003), hep-th/0305018.
- [21] L. Pilo, A. Riotto, and A. Zaffaroni, JHEP **07**, 052 (2004), hep-th/0401004.
- [22] S. P. de Alwis, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 126001 (2003), hep-th/0307084.
- [23] S. P. de Alwis, Phys. Lett. **B603**, 230 (2004), hep-th/0407126.
- [24] J. L. Feng, J. March-Russell, S. Sethi, and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. **B602**, 307 (2001), hep-th/0005276.
- [25] For related earlier work see [18].
- [26] As for instance in [8] - for a complete list of references see for example [16].
- [27] The analog of the BT and BP processes in this context was discussed by [19][20][21].
- [28] This factorized ansatz is not suitable for the derivation of a potential when there is non-trivial warping as pointed out in [22, 23] however it is adequate for estimating the relevant scales provided we take into account the effective dependence of the warp factor on the volume modulus as discussed in [13].
- [29] Of course we are assuming that e^ϕ is not greater than one - which is a starting assumption of all these effective field theory arguments.
- [30] The Bianchi identity for the five form flux would imply that there is a corresponding change in the effective number of D3 branes.
- [31] In the extreme case of the cycle shrinking almost to zero this would be equivalent to the version of the BT process of [24].